

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 34-41, and 43-46 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 9, 18, 35, and 38 being the independent claims. Claims 1-17 and 35-37 have been withdrawn. Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 25-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41, and 43-46 are sought to be amended. Claim 24 is sought to be canceled with out disclaimer of or prejudice to the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 18, 19, 21, 22, 24-27, 29, 30, 34, 38-41, and 43-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action states that "[i]t is unclear what the term "mirrored" encompasses." (Office Action, p. 3). Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicant has amended claims 18, 19, 24-27, 29, 30, 34, 38, 40, 41, and 43-46 to remove the term "mirrored." Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Simon and Murthy

Claims 18, 19, 25-27, 38, 39, and 45-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Simon *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0093691 (“Simon”), in view of Murthy *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,515,376 (“Murthy”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The combination of Simon and Murthy does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 18 and 38. In Simon, the security association [SA] repository update procedure “is triggered when an end node 1009 terminates a link-layer association 1006, 1008 (Block 1200) with an edge router 1001 (for example, by ceasing communications with an access point pursuant to the IEEE 802.11 or Bluetooth link-layer protocols, where that access point is on the same network segment as the edge router 1001).” (Simon, [0080]). Thus, Simon does not teach or suggest:

sending the updated security association information associated with the first secure packet flow from the first security processor to the second security processor in a first update packet when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the first secure packet flow reaches a first predefined value;

sending the updated security association information associated with the second secure packet flow for the second security processor to the first security processor in a second update packet when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the second secure packet flow reaches a second predefined value

as recited in amended independent claim 18. Simon further does not teach or suggest:

a first security processor configured to process a first packet flow, and update security association information in response to the first packet flow, and send the updated security association

information associated with the first packet flow in a first update packet when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the first secure packet flow reaches a first predefined value; and

a second security processor configured to process a second packet flow, and update security association information in response to the second packet flow, and send the updated security association information associated with the second packet flow in a second update packet when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the second secure packet flow reaches a second predefined value

as recited in amended independent claim 38.

Murthy does not overcome the above deficiencies of Simon. For at least these reasons, amended independent claims 18 and 38 are patentable over the combination of Simon and Murthy. Claims 19, 25-27, and 45 depend from claim 18 and claims 39 and 46 depend from claim 38. For at least the above reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 19, 25-27, 29, 45, and 46 are patentable over the combination of Simon and Murthy. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Simon, Murthy, and Xiong

Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Simon and Murthy, and in view of Xiong *et al.*, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0061507 (“Xiong”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 21, 22, 24, 29, 30, and 34 depend from amended claim 18. Xiong describes that “[a] sequence number counter is a 32-bit value used to generate a sequence number for sequence number fields in AH and ESP headers.” (Xiong, [0023]). Xiong further describes that a security association has a lifetime which is “a

time interval after which a security association is replaced with a new security association ..." (Xiong, [0023]). Xiong does not teach or suggest that updated security association information is sent "when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the first secure packet flow reaches a first predefined value" or "when a sequence number in the security association information associated with the second secure packet flow reaches a second predefined value," as recited in independent claim 18.

Thus, Xiong does not overcome the deficiencies of Simon and Murthy relative to amended claim 18 described above. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 21, 22, 29, 30, and 34 are patentable over the combination of Simon, Murthy, and Xiong. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Simon, Murthy, and Rosenow

Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Simon and Murthy, and in view of Rosenow *et al.*, U.S. Patent No. 5,022,076 ("Rosenow"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 depend from amended claim 38. Rosenow does not overcome the deficiencies of Simon and Murthy relative to amended claim 38 described above. For at least these reasons, and further in view of their own features, dependent claims 40, 41, 43, and 44 are patentable over the combination of Simon, Murthy, and Rosenow. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 50,633

Date: February 10, 2009

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600
878774_1.DOC